



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,672	02/27/2002	Jered Donald Aasheim	183343.01	6395

22971 7590 07/11/2007

MICROSOFT CORPORATION  
ONE MICROSOFT WAY  
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER
----------

PATEL, HETUL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/11/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com  
ntovar@microsoft.com  
a-rydore@microsoft.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/087,672	AASHEIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hetul Patel	2186	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hetul Patel. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Lance R Sadler (Reg. No.: 38,605). (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 July 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ban (USPN: 5,799,168) and Blumenau (USPN: 5,875,478).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

H.B. Patel  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney alleged that the combination of Ban and Blumenau prior arts in the rejection of claim 1 is improper. Attorney pointed out that Ban teaches about "standardized driver" to be configured on CPU and placing the burden of flash chip manufacturer (specific) drivers on the controller on the flash chip. Therefore, the flash unit (the combination of flash chip and the controller) is capable of recognizing standardized commands from the standardized driver of the CPU. In short, Ban places " a unique controller" on "each individual flash chip". Thus if the drivers/controllers are placed on the CPU (as suggested by Blaumenau) for interacting multiple unique flash chips with the drivers, then the very purpose of "standardized driver" taught by Ban gets completely destroyed.

Examiner suggested Attorney to file this argument in the next official response and Examiner will reconsider and response to it.